

**To:** "mesl@shaw.ca" [mesl@shaw.ca]  
**Cc:** Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA[]; oe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA[]  
**From:** "Keefe, Jennifer"  
**Sent:** Tue 3/13/2012 2:40:18 PM  
**Subject:** Portland Harbor Specific Comments for Formal Responses  
7-1-11 BERA Response to EPA Comments Draft Final JK 3.12.12 All.xlsx

Good morning Don,

My understanding is that you were requested to review the original DRAFT BERA for Portland Harbor with a specific interest in the following topics: reference envelope, toxicity test hit definitions, and mean quotient calculations. Additionally, all members of the team were requested to think about data presentation/figures and localized risks. I have not identified specific comments from the compiled comment list specifically associated with your areas of interest.

However, I have compiled the attached spreadsheet that includes comments that I thought covered data presentation/figures and localized risks. This spreadsheet is simply a smaller version of the larger spreadsheet circulated during the meeting in Portland. I have done some additional work, so this one includes the most up-to-date "CDM review comments" from me.

The comments included in this spreadsheet are: the first # 5; 17, 30, 37, 75, 83, 92, 96, 97, 122, 123, 126, 131, 149, 177, 178, 199.

Here is my request so that we meet our deadline:

The comments noted above are those that I have categorized as being "partially addressed" or "not addressed." Please use my notes in the "CDM Review Comment" as guidance and provide me with a formalized response in the "New EPA Comment" and "New Comment Code" fields.

Items to note:

If you feel as though I have missed comments that you should comment on from the master list distributed for the meeting in Portland, please let me know and I can either send you a revised spreadsheet or you can add your additional formalized responses to an email and I will incorporate them into the final spreadsheet.

Please remember that I was not to review/make a judgment regarding the quality of the response and I could not evaluate compliance with subsequent agreements made that LWG references. Also, I did not often take LWG's response into consideration when reviewing.

The page numbers, sections, paragraph numbers are based on the clean version of the revised DRAFT FINAL BERA.

If you have any questions or concerns, please let me know.

Thank you in advance for your assistance,  
Jenn

Jennifer Keefe, M.P.H.  
Environmental Scientist  
CDM Smith  
50 Hampshire Street  
Cambridge, MA 02139

Tel/Fax: 617.452.6314  
keefejm@cdmsmith.com  
cdmsmith.com